

GALE STOKES

## Svetozar Marković in Russia

Since the establishment of socialist governments in Eastern Europe following World War II, Svetozar Marković has become the most celebrated figure of nineteenth-century Yugoslav history.<sup>1</sup> Not only was Marković the first important socialist in the Balkans, but he received his education in Russian populism at its source in St. Petersburg, participated in the activities of the Russian Section of the First International in Switzerland, organized the first consumers' and workers' collectives in the Balkans, and edited Serbia's first socialist newspaper. An incisive critic of the Serbian bureaucracy, Marković hoped to avoid the pitfalls of modernization in Serbia by establishing a democratic system of local administration based on the traditional peasant commune. Even though he was not successful, his vigorous analyses of social problems, his faith in science, and his uncompromising idealism exerted a strong influence on his contemporaries, turning the politically inclined among them from liberalism to radicalism and the artistically inclined from romanticism to realism. Little wonder, therefore, that since World War II this unusual and brilliant man has become a cultural hero in Yugoslavia.

Svetozar Marković reached adolescence at about the time Michael Obrenović became Prince of Serbia in 1860. Because of his outstanding record as a student at the Belgrade Academy (*Velika škola*), he received a scholarship to study at the Alexander I Institute of Communication Engineers in St. Peters-

1. The basic studies on Marković include Jovan Skerlić, *Svetozar Marković: Njegov život, rad i ideje* (Belgrade, 1910), republished as part of *Sabrana dela Jovana Skerlića* (Belgrade, 1966); Slobodan Jovanović, "Svetozar Marković," *Političke i pravne rasprave*, vol. 2 of his *Sabrana dela* (Belgrade, 1932), pp. 59–298; Woodford D. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković and the Origins of Balkan Socialism* (Princeton, 1964); and Vitomir Vuletić, *Svetozar Marković i ruski revolucionarni demokrati* (Novi Sad, 1964). The standard Russian interpretation is summarized by Viktor Karasev, "Serbskii revoliutsionnyi demokrat Svetozar Markovich," *Uchenye zapiski Instituta slavianovedeniia*, 7 (1953): 348–77. For a broader account incorporating much recent Russian scholarship see Viktor Karasev and V. D. Konobeev, "O svyaziakh russkikh, serbskikh i bolgarskikh revoliutsionerov v 60-70-kh godakh XIX veka," *Actes du premier congrès international des études sud-est européennes*, 4 (1969): 201–13. See also the excellent interpretive essay by Vaso Čubrilović in his *Istorija političke misli u Srbiji XIX veka* (Belgrade, 1958), pp. 271–320, and the recent, clear presentation of Andrija Radenić, "Svetozar Marković i ujedinjena omladina srpska," in *Ujedinjena omladina srpska: Zbornik radova* (Novi Sad, 1968), pp. 105–32, hereafter abbreviated *UOS*. The most accessible collection of Marković's writings is *Sabrani spisi*, vol. 1 (Belgrade, 1960), edited by Najdan Pasić; vols. 2–4 (Belgrade, 1965), edited by Radovan Blagojević.

burg, where he enrolled in August 1866 at the age of nineteen. Marković came to Russia unformed politically, but after two and one-half years in St. Petersburg he transferred his studies to Zurich in order to enter active political life. One year after that he began calling himself a socialist. Quite naturally, this transformation has attracted the attention of a number of scholars, who, over the years, have created a standard account of Marković's Russian experience.

According to this account, "from the first days of his stay in St. Petersburg, [Marković] entered into the ideas and life of 'the new people' of Russia."<sup>2</sup> The work of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, the populist socialist, quickly drew his attention and began to mold his social conscience and political viewpoint. Inspired by Chernyshevsky, Marković shed the naïve political beliefs he had picked up as a schoolboy in Belgrade and dedicated himself to "the lively, progressive ideological and political struggle."<sup>3</sup> Working "tirelessly" in the St. Petersburg section of the Serbian youth movement, he soon came into contact with the Smorgon Academy, "a Russian revolutionary organization[,] and became an integral part of it,"<sup>4</sup> participating in many of its activities and even traveling to Odessa on its behalf. In the fall of 1868, when the Third Section arrested a friend for revolutionary activities, Marković came under suspicion himself and realized he would have to discontinue his engineering studies: "After the riots of the St. Petersburg and Moscow students [in March 1869] . . . Marković had no other choice than to leave Russia."<sup>5</sup> Supplied with money by the revolutionary movement, he departed for Switzerland to contact the International on behalf of Russian socialism.

Unfortunately this exciting and romantic story, which is fully appropriate to Marković's heroic dimensions in Yugoslav historiography, is seriously deficient both in implication and in detail. It has become established in part because of the tendency of postwar historians to emphasize the influence of Russian socialism on Yugoslavia and in part because of the exalted revolutionary reputation of Marković's model, Chernyshevsky. Since there is no question that Marković became a socialist, nor that Chernyshevsky exercised an important influence on him, it has been easy to assume that Marković was a part of the underground life of Russian socialism throughout his stay in Russia. This assumption has been useful for Soviet historians anxious to enhance the revolutionary reputation of Chernyshevsky by increasing his follower's revolutionary ardor,<sup>6</sup> but it makes several features of Marković's career

2. Skerlić, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 31. Uncritically repeated by Vladimir Viktorov-Toporov, "Svetozar Markovich," *Golos minuvshago*, 1913, no. 3, p. 36.

3. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:xx.

4. Vitomir Vuletić, "Svetozar Marković i Prva internacionala," *Prilozi za istoriju socijalizma*, 2 (1965): 161.

5. *Ibid.*

6. For an excellent discussion of the efforts of Soviet historians to canonize Cherny-

in Russia difficult to understand. Furthermore, by concentrating on the Russian and socialist backgrounds of the Yugoslav past, postwar historians have lost sight of the fact that the most important outside influences on Balkan political and social ideology during the second half of the nineteenth century came not from Russia, nor even from socialism, but from the West, especially from the liberalisms of southern Germany, France, and England. The results of an oversensitivity to Russian and socialist influences are nowhere better demonstrated than in the history of Svetozar Marković's career in Russia.<sup>7</sup> A more accurate, if less melodramatic, picture of his stay there would make a good starting point for re-establishing a balanced interpretation of cultural and political influences on Serbia and the Balkans during the second half of the nineteenth century.

The Russian underground of which Marković supposedly became an active associate during his stay in St. Petersburg was in a state of disarray at the time of his arrival in August 1866. The unsuccessful attempt of Ivan Karakozov to assassinate Tsar Alexander II several months before had brought on such a severe repression that overt political activity among students almost disappeared until early in 1869. The only underground organization that scholars have uncovered during the period from 1866 to 1869 is a handful of students and others who lived communally, as did many Russian students late in the sixties, and who called themselves the Smorgon Academy.<sup>8</sup> Marković never belonged to this shadowy group, but he did come in contact with it through his acquaintance with Ivan Bochkarev, a well-meaning liberal who cultivated his relations with Serbs living in Russia and spent several years in the late sixties pursuing vague but noble notions of Slavic unity and social reform.<sup>9</sup> Circumstantial evidence indicates that Bochkarev introduced Marković to Varlaam Cherkezov, a former member of the revolutionary Ishutin group and a member of the Smorgon Academy, at the beginning of 1868.<sup>10</sup>

---

shevsky see Norman Pereira's dissertation, "N. G. Chernyshevsky: An Intellectual Biography" (Berkeley, 1970; University Microfilms, order no. 71-15,861), pp. 253-80. Pereira calls the technique of honoring Chernyshevsky by linking his name with revolutionary activists "honor by association" (p. 268).

7. The American authority on Marković, Woodford McClellan, has called attention to this phenomenon by criticizing his own book for its tendency to "exaggerate the significance of Russian influence" on Balkan socialism. See his "Serbia and Social Democracy, 1870-1878," *International Review of Social History*, 11 (1966): 48. Despite this, and despite the criticisms made in this article, McClellan's book is a well-balanced monograph which stands alongside Skerlić as the best work on the subject.

8. B. P. Koz'min, *Revoliutsionnoe podpol'e v epokhu "Belogo Terrora"* (Moscow, 1929), pp. 136-37, 142, and passim; McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 56; Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution* (New York, 1966, paper), p. 351.

9. Vitimir Vuletić, "Jedna ruska veza Ujedinjene omladine srpske," *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu*, 6 (1962-63): 143-55.

10. The basic document is Max Nettlau's obituary of Varlaam Cherkezov, *Plus loin*,

Since it is agreed that Cherkezov led Marković to the study of Chernyshevsky and to an acquaintance with other revolutionary democrats, it appears that Marković encountered Chernyshevsky's work for the first time about half-way through his stay in St. Petersburg.

The belief that Marković must have come in contact with the ideas of Chernyshevsky very soon after his arrival in Russia derives from two mistaken assumptions: that Marković was a "revolutionary democrat" throughout his entire stay in St. Petersburg,<sup>11</sup> and that Chernyshevsky's influence was ubiquitous. In the first surge of post-World War II excitement, some writers attempted to show that Marković was a revolutionary democrat while he was still a teen-age student in Belgrade, but that interpretation has been recognized as overenthusiastic.<sup>12</sup> When Marković left Belgrade for Russia in 1866 hoping to learn to serve his country as an engineer, he had been drawn to the ideas of national liberation and unification which Vladimir Jovanović and other Serbian liberals supported, but he was as yet only vaguely familiar with socialism and revolutionary democracy.<sup>13</sup>

In St. Petersburg Marković could not have entered immediately into the Russian student movements of the technical school, if any existed, because he did not know the Russian language very well.<sup>14</sup> Instead, he fed his budding interest in politics by joining *Srpska opština* (Serbian Commune), the Serbian club in St. Petersburg. *Srpska opština* was not a revolutionary or socialist organization, but a mutual aid society founded in the spring of 1866 under the protection of the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Its first and foremost purpose was to insure that each Serb "in the foreign land did not cease being a Serb."<sup>15</sup> The society gathered funds and dispersed them

1925, no. 8, p. 3, available from the Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam. The dates Bochkarev was in St. Petersburg and could have made the introduction are given in Koz'min, *Revolutsionnoe podpol'e*, pp. 37–39. Only late 1867 or early 1868 is consistent with all the evidence. See Karasev, "Serbskii demokrat," p. 354.

11. For a short discussion of the term "revolutionary democrat," which Soviet authors apply to nineteenth-century figures who, though lacking knowledge of Marx, expressed views partly acceptable to Marxists, see Pereira, "Chernyshevsky," pp. 253–56.

12. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 35.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 40. For Marković's enthusiastic letter to Jovanović in 1865 see *Sabrani spisi*, 1:3–4.

14. On August 17/29, 1866, Marković and his schoolmate, Aleksa Knežević, wrote the Serbian Ministry of Education that they were enrolled in first-year courses and would be permitted to take the third-year examinations at the end of the school year, since the first two years of the Institute curriculum repeated the three years of training they had already completed in Belgrade. However, they believed that this would be "impossible because we do not know the language" (Arhiv Srbije, Ministarstvo prosvete, 1874, box VI, inventory no. 828, abbreviated below AS:MP-1874-VI-828). In October Marković wrote his brother Jevrem that he could understand Russian but not speak it well (*Sabrani spisi*, 1:5). Cf. Karasev, "Serbskii demokrat," p. 353, where Karasev reports that Marković studied Russian in Belgrade "intensely."

15. *Zastava*, Sept. 3/15, 1867, original in italics. The report from *Srpska opština* to

to needy countrymen in Russia and established a small library of Balkanology for its members' use. It also maintained close contact with Serbian politics through emissaries it sent periodically to Belgrade, Novi Sad, and Vienna.

Advocates of Marković's immediate conversion to socialism claim that it would have been impossible for him to remain long in St. Petersburg without coming in contact with Chernyshevsky's ideas, but this is not necessarily true. By the time Marković arrived in St. Petersburg, the repression that followed Karakozov's attempt to assassinate Alexander II had silenced loose talk. Peter Kropotkin, who returned to the city in 1867 after an absence of five years, hoped that he was returning to the "St. Petersburg of Chernyshevsky," but found instead that the progressives of 1862 were now "either leaning toward a sort of paternal absolutism, or . . . had become so cautious . . . that their prudence was almost equal to desertion." Kropotkin found the torpor even worse when he spoke with people who were not writers: "In the [early] sixties, Russia, and especially St. Petersburg, was full of men of advanced opinion. . . . I looked up some of them, but 'prudence young man!' was all they had to say."<sup>16</sup> The months from mid-1866 until late 1868 were the quietest of the sixties in St. Petersburg, and it would have been entirely possible for a young foreign student interested in the nationalistic goal of uniting his people to remain unaware of the ideas of clandestine socialism.

The false assumption that Marković quickly became a revolutionary democratic activist has led to a whole series of problems in interpreting his career in Russia. An unfortunate example is the "mystery" of the summer of 1867.<sup>17</sup> On two occasions Marković said that he had visited Serbian lands that summer;<sup>18</sup> his request for leave from the Institute of Communication Engineers stated that he intended to go to Serbia;<sup>19</sup> and in May 1867, Sava Grujić, a schoolmate of Marković's in St. Petersburg, wrote Vladimir Jovanović, who was living in Novi Sad, saying, "You will receive that document you asked me

---

the second annual congress of the United Serbian Youth (Omladina) appeared in the following issues of *Zastava* for 1867: September 3/15, September 7/19, October 8/20, November 5/17, and November 9/21. Although the society did not adopt its constitution until January 1867, this report conclusively demonstrates that *Srpska opština* was organized by Serbs living in Russia before Marković arrived in St. Petersburg. Only half the membership consisted of students; the remainder were tradesmen and others. Most authors have followed Skerlić's account, based on a report in the newspaper *Srbija*, which magnifies Marković's role by stating that *Srpska opština* was organized in the course of 1867 and by calling him a "founder" (Skerlić, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 32). Cf. B. P. Koz'min, "Po stranitsam knig i zhurnalov," *Katorga i ssylka*, 1933, no. 4-5, p. 153; Vuletić, *Marković i ruski demokrati*, p. 37; McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 51; and Karasev, "Serbskii demokrat," p. 355.

16. Peter Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (Boston, 1899), pp. 249, 250.

17. The word "mystery" is McClellan's (*Svetozar Marković*, p. 55).

18. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:7, 19-20.

19. K. A. Pushkarevich, "Svetozar Markovich v Peterburge," *Trudy Instituta slavianovedeniia*, 1 (1932): 348.

to send you from the hand of Svetozar Marković. . . . In a few days he is going to Serbia for the summer.”<sup>20</sup> Despite this unequivocal evidence, postwar historians have given serious consideration to the suggestion made by Viktor Karasev that Marković probably went to Odessa that summer on behalf of the Smorgon Academy to establish contact with an obscure revolutionary organization, the “Slavic-Serbian Society.”<sup>21</sup> Karasev bases his hypothesis on the testimony of a Serbian visitor to St. Petersburg that Marković had “gone south.”<sup>22</sup> Even though this same visitor reported in an earlier account that Marković “had gone to Serbia,”<sup>23</sup> Karasev has decided that Marković, who he believes was a confirmed revolutionary activist, was an early contact between Smorgon and Odessa.<sup>24</sup>

In the first place, in 1867 Marković had not yet met Cherkezov, the man who introduced him to advanced Russian thought. Furthermore, there is no evidence to refute the several statements he and others made that he went to Serbia; even beyond that, the Slavic-Serbian Society he supposedly contacted there in all probability did not exist in 1867. The evidence for its existence at that early date is an undocumented assertion by Jovan Skerlić.<sup>25</sup> But *Srbija* (*Serbia*), a liberal newspaper published in Belgrade, reported early in 1869 that a society called *Slaveno-srpsko bratstvo* (Slavic-Serbian Brotherhood) “recently” had been formed in Odessa,<sup>26</sup> and it is known from another source

20. Grujić to Jovanović, May 18/30, 1867 (Arhiv Srbije, Pokloni i otkupi, box 73, inventory no. 293 [AS:PO-73-293]). I would like to thank Mr. Radivoj Lukić of Zrenjanin for transcribing the two almost illegible letters from Grujić to Jovanović in this file and in AS:PO-73-292.

21. Karasev, “Serbskii demokrat,” p. 354. McClellan is cautious (*Svetozar Marković*, pp. 54–55), but Vuletić adopts the idea unreservedly: “It is certain . . . that he did not go to Serbia that summer” (Vitimir Vuletić, “Svetozar Marković u Rusiji i Švajcarskoj,” *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke*, 38 [1964]: 36). Karasev actually presents his hypothesis as an improvement over an early suggestion that had Marković going to the Crimea (e.g., Božidar Kovačević, “Život Svetozara Markovića,” *Književnost*, 1, no. 9 [September–December 1946]: 116).

22. Milan Đ. Milićević, *Dodatak Pomeniku od 1888* (Belgrade, 1901), p. 86.

23. Milan Đ. Milićević, *Etnografska izložba i slovenski sastanak u Moskvi 1867* (Belgrade, 1884), p. 71. The possibility that Marković may have gone to or returned from Serbia via Odessa is made highly unlikely by the fact that the railroad to that city was not yet finished in 1867. In 1866 Marković had followed the usual route to St. Petersburg from Belgrade, which went up the Danube by steamer to Vienna, then by train to Warsaw, Vilna, and St. Petersburg (Rektor no. 214, July 1/13, 1866, AS:MP-1874-VI-828; *Sabrani spisi*, 1:4; Milićević, *Etnografska izložba*, pp. 6–15).

24. Karasev also cites E. N. Kusheva, “Iz rusko-serbskikh revoliutsionnykh sviazei 1870-kh godov,” *Uchenye zapiski Instituta slavianovedeniia*, 1 (1949): 343–58, but these links with Odessa are all from the 1870s.

25. Jovan Skerlić, *Omladina i njena književnost* (Belgrade, 1906), republished as part of *Sabrana dela Jovana Skerlića* (Belgrade, 1966), p. 112. McClellan also cites Kusheva (*Svetozar Marković*, p. 55), but Kusheva does not mention the society.

26. *Srbija*, Feb. 20/Mar. 4, 1869.

that in January 1869 the South Slavs in Odessa were contemplating founding a benevolent society similar to those in Moscow and St. Petersburg.<sup>27</sup> Thus the Slavic-Serbian Society probably was organized in 1869 as a transitional group which led to the creation of the Odessa Benevolent Committee.<sup>28</sup> In the face of the statements by Marković and others, the utter lack of evidence that Marković went to Odessa, and the probable absence of a society to visit there, it seems safe to assume that his mission to that city is a figment of overheated historical imagination. Far from proving how revolutionary Marković was in 1867, the anecdote simply shows how anxious his biographers have been to show that he was a revolutionary.

Another example of misinterpretation concerns Marković's advocacy of revolt in Bosnia, which has been taken as proof of his radicalism. Through *Srpska opština* Marković kept in close touch with all factions that sought to bring about an uprising in Bosnia, including the war party in Montenegro.<sup>29</sup> As a result of his visit to Serbia in 1867, when he acted as an emissary of *Srpska opština*, Marković proposed early in 1868 that a society be formed "of our young officers and other honest people . . . [which would] show P[rince] M[ichael] how he could achieve *the crown of Serbian king* without risking anything, that is, by arming bands of volunteers and sending them into Bosnia, Hercegovina, and the Balkans under the direction of his own officers. . . ." "We must turn all our means to liberation from the Turks and to political unification," he wrote to his brother Jevrem. "The first thing we need . . . is a *people free from foreign influence*. . . . Everything depends on [that]. . . ."<sup>30</sup>

27. M. A. Hitrovo to N. P. Ignatiev, Jan. 4, 1869 (O.S.?), cited by S. A. Nikitin, *Slavianskie komitety v Rossii v 1858-1876 godakh* (Moscow, 1960), p. 53.

28. Michael B. Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan Slavism, 1856-1870* (New York, 1956), pp. 144-45.

29. *Zastava*, Nov. 9/21, 1867; Sava Grujić to Vladimir Jovanović, May 14/26, 1867 (AS:PO-73-292); *Sabrani spisi*, 1:5, 19-20; and Viktor Karasev, "Iz istorije rusko-srpskih revolucionarnih veza u prvoj polovini sedamdesetih godina XIX veka," *Istorijski glasnik*, 1962, p. 91. In his letter to Jovanović of May 18/30, 1867 (AS:PO-73-293), Grujić said, "Yesterday a letter arrived from Cetinje from the Archimandrite [Nićifor Dučić] in which he describes the political situation there in dark colors. The Montenegrin court is divided into two parties: a 'party for unity,' which came up with this agreement (which you will receive [from the hands of Marković]) and [which is] headed by the old prince (Tucović and [unclear word] are part of it); and a separatist party which does not want Montenegrin independence to be subordinated to Serbian. . . ." Cf. Vaso Vojvodić's interpretation, "Ujedinjena omladina srpska i pripremanje ustanka na Balkanu 1871-1872. godine," *UOS*, p. 308.

30. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:7-8, 24, original italics (the last from "Srpskoj omladini," April 1868). Marković's remarks to his brother are prefaced by the words, "Our proposal (*from Opština*) [Marković's emphasis] is that there be formed in Serbia . . . etc." He went on to say, "Along with that it is understood that at the same time Montenegro would begin hostilities." These are the plans Marković discussed with his brother in the summer of 1867.

Clearly, Marković advocated revolt in Bosnia. The problem is that in the sixties this was not a program of Russian radicalism at all. Russian Pan-Slavs, Serbian liberals, and, until mid-1867, even the Serbian prince, Michael Obrenović, hoped to use a national uprising in Bosnia, but Russian radicals scarcely thought about it.<sup>31</sup> Prince Michael's foreign policy was to establish the independence of the Serbian principality, which was still a province of the Ottoman Empire, and to unite the Serbs living outside the principality under his rule. Michael never actually committed himself to a war of national liberation, but he allowed his foreign minister to establish and maintain a network of underground agents in South Slavic lands, especially in Bosnia and Hercegovina, and tried to strengthen his armed forces.<sup>32</sup>

Although liberals such as Vladimir Jovanović violently opposed Michael's repressive internal policy, all Serbs, liberal and conservative, sympathized with the prince's wish to unify Serbs into one state. The liberals' only complaint, and Svetozar Marković's, was that Michael and his government were not sufficiently aggressive. When the Turks removed their last remaining troops from Serbia in 1867, the liberals complained that Michael's bloodless victory was too peaceful. Michael should draw his sword, they said, not enter into a net of diplomatic intrigue in which Serbia would become "a plaything in the hands of foreign intriguers."<sup>33</sup> "Is there anyone," an anonymous writer asked in a liberal newspaper, "who still can believe that the freedom of the Christian peoples . . . and the unity and independence of the Serbian state on the Balkan peninsula can be achieved peacefully? . . . Without Bosnia and Hercegovina the Serbian nation does not have a future."<sup>34</sup>

31. When Ivan Bochkarev met Alexander Herzen in Geneva in 1867, for example, Herzen told him to stop bothering about the South Slavs, because they were undeveloped and because Europe would not tolerate any subversive movements among them anyway (Koz'min, *Revolutsionnoe podpol'e*, p. 98). Cf. Sergej A. Nikitin, "Srpski politički život 60-tih godina XIX veka u ruskoj štampi (periodika)," *UOS*, p. 368.

32. The basic work on Michael's foreign policy is now Grgur Jakšić and Vojislav Vučković, *Spoljna politika Srbije za vlade kneza Mihaila: Prvi balkanski savez* (Belgrade, 1963). See also Slobodan Jovanović, *Druga vlada Miloša i Mihaila* (Belgrade, 1923); Vojislav Vučković, ed., *Politička akcija Srbije u Južnoslovenskim pokrajinama Habsburške monarhije, 1859–1874* (Belgrade, 1965); and Nikola Petrović, ed., *Svetozar Miletić i narodna stranka: Građa, 1860–1885*, vol. 1 (Sremski Karlovci, 1968). One of the most stubborn questions of Yugoslav historiography is how ready Michael was for military action in 1867 and 1868. For a bibliography of the basic polemical literature see Jakšić and Vučković, *Spoljna politika*, pp. 7–8. Today the debate centers on whether the government's policy of diplomatic activity from 1867 through 1872 was more functional than the opposition's program of revolt in Bosnia. See Nikola Petrović, "Istorijско mesto, uloga i značaj ujedinjene omladine srpske," *UOS*, pp. 22–23, and the articles cited there. See also the article by Vaso Vojvodić and the remarks by Čedomir Popov in the same volume.

33. *Zastava*, Mar. 18/30, 1867. See also the article "I opet Beograd ili Srpstvo?" *Zastava*, Apr. 13/25 and 15/27, 1867.

34. *Zastava*, Nov. 16/28, 1867.



Russian Pan-Slavs also thought that the Serbs should attempt to secure their liberation and unification by force. Both Ivan Aksakov in Moscow and Mikhail Katkov in St. Petersburg believed that the Serbs held the key position in the Balkans. Even though both of them supported the Russian government's policy of not directly assisting uprisings there, they thought that the Russian government should not intervene if outbreaks occurred. Aksakov had faith in the Serbian tradition of guerrilla warfare, whereas Katkov had a more hard-headed appreciation of the importance of an organized army, but both hinted in 1867 that the time was ripe for a revolt.<sup>35</sup>

Early in 1868 Marković wrote a friend enthusiastically about the willingness, even the desire, of the Russian people to come to the aid of the Serbs in case of a national uprising. Professor McClellan has expressed confusion that these views, as he puts it, "served the interests of the reactionary Pan-Slavs."<sup>36</sup> McClellan's perplexity is an excellent example of the difficulty historians have had interpreting Marković's views because of their belief in his revolutionary socialism. Marković's advocacy of revolt in Bosnia derived from a semiofficial policy of the Serbian government, resembled the militant position of liberal Serbian nationalists, and was consistent with the view of Russian Pan-Slavs. It had nothing to do with revolutionary socialism, with which Marković had only just come in contact early in 1868. Furthermore, Marković was active in a club of Serbian students which was under the protection of the Asiatic Department, a stronghold of Pan-Slavism, and he may even have received a portion of his stipend from Pan-Slav sources.<sup>37</sup> It should come as no surprise then that he naïvely forwarded ideas associated with Russian Pan-Slavism early in 1868. At that moment those were his ideas as well.

During his first eighteen months in Russia, therefore, Svetozar Marković did not enter into the life of the Russian underground nor did he change his views appreciably. But neither did he remain a passive engineering student. He vigorously participated, insofar as his youth and distance from home permitted, in Serbian politics. This combination of study and activism suited Marković's youthful idea of himself as a participant in the great nineteenth-century drama of unfolding freedom. On the one hand he was training himself to serve the material progress of his people by becoming an engineer, while on the other hand he was working to insure Serbia's unification through a popular uprising. After encountering the populist elements of Russian radical thought early in 1868, however, Marković began to lose interest in the first of these two avocations. His hitherto casual involvement in politics began to seem

35. Stephen Lukashovich, *Ivan Aksakov, 1823–1886* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), pp. 128–29, and Nikitin, "Srpski politički život," pp. 364–66.

36. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 59. Note that the statement McClellan cites in note 86, in which Marković says, "I want liberation through popular revolt—through revolution," was made in December 1870, two years after the period under discussion.

37. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 43.

frivolous compared with the dedication of the Russian radicals, and liberal nationalism began to seem superficial compared with Russian populism. Marković never discarded his hope that the Serbs would be liberated and united, nor did he quickly discard the tools of social analysis he borrowed from the liberal Vladimir Jovanović,<sup>38</sup> but in 1868 he began to conceive of a new way to serve his country and his ideals.

Signs of Marković's change soon appeared. In the spring of 1868 he attended a meeting at which Pisarev spoke, and reported the occasion glowingly in the Serbian press.<sup>39</sup> In June, when Prince Michael was assassinated, he wrote his first politically significant article, "What Must We Do?"<sup>40</sup> In this article Marković pointed out that Serbia did not have the same kinds of institutions as Western Europe and that therefore, in the changed situation after Michael's death, the new government should not thoughtlessly introduce foreign political devices that would not suit Serbian circumstances. Instead, he said, Serbia should look to its native strengths, such as the *zadruga* and other institutions of community help, as models for social organization.

Once again the belief that Marković was a confirmed revolutionary socialist has led to speculation concerning this article. Professor McClellan has suggested that the article contains sufficient elements of Marxist thought to hint that Marxism may have penetrated Russia before the early seventies.<sup>41</sup> One reason that McClellan's suggestion has not been widely adopted is that the Marxist strain in Marković's thought never was strong, even later. He favored Bakunin in the struggles within the International, for example. Far from adopting materialism in "What Must We Do?" he stressed cultural and intellectual development as the key to the future, as the following passage suggests: "The progress of a nation in all spheres depends solely on its intellectual development, and intellectual development depends solely on the ability of each individual to use his mind, on freedom, and [on] popular self-administration."<sup>42</sup>

38. In his article "Velika Srbija," written late in 1868, Marković took his golden rule of social and economic progress directly from Jovanović's famous pamphlet of 1864, *Srbenda i gotovan*, quoting Jovanović's basic phrase, "Good for all in everything" (*Sabrani spisi*, 1:100). One year later Marković said, "The writer of *Srbenda i gotovan* correctly sketched the relations of production and consumption in Serbia" (1:163).

39. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:27–29.

40. "Šta treba da radimo?" *Sabrani spisi*, 1:58–69. It has been suggested that this title was inspired by Chernyshevsky's novel, *What Is To Be Done?* This may be so, but an exact translation of Chernyshevsky's title is "Šta da se radi?," and other articles with similar titles appeared in Serbian newspapers both before and after Marković's article (e.g., "Šta da radimo?" *Zastava*, Nov. 5/17, 1867).

41. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, pp. 60–61. For a sophisticated new analysis of the sources of Marković's thought, not just during this period but in general, see Andrija B. Stojković, "Moralističko-etički pogledi ujedinjene omladine srpske," *UOS*, pp. 51–76, and the same author's "Pogled na razvoj filozofije marksizma u jugoslovenskim zemljama," *Zbornik za društvene nauke*, 53 (1969): esp. 6–11.

42. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:68, original entirely in italics.

A less strained interpretation of Marković's critical article on the occasion of Prince Michael's assassination is that it is an eclectic work containing notions of liberty and self-administration learned from Vladimir Jovanović, an appreciation of the commune based on Chernyshevsky, and the idea common to several Russian thinkers of the late sixties that a special duty lay before the critically thinking individual.

During his final months in St. Petersburg, as he analyzed the changed circumstances in Serbia following Prince Michael's death, Marković concluded that the Serbian monarchy was an impediment to the realization of national liberation and unification.<sup>43</sup> This line of thought, similar to Chernyshevsky's reasoning of a decade before,<sup>44</sup> soon turned Marković against the Serbian liberals, many of whom had rallied to the monarchy following Prince Michael's assassination.<sup>45</sup> His re-evaluation of the political situation in Serbia, combined with his growing enthusiasm for Russian revolutionary democracy, convinced him that he should abandon the study of engineering for good and devote himself entirely to politics. Accordingly, at the beginning of the fall semester of 1868 Marković decided to leave Russia and become a "political worker."<sup>46</sup>

Marković's decision came shortly after the Third Section had arrested his Russian friend Ivan Bochkarev. Vitomir Vuletić has suggested that this may have been the event that convinced Marković it was time to leave Russia.<sup>47</sup> But Marković's resolve to become a political worker was not a sudden choice. It grew out of many months of increasing intellectual turmoil. Furthermore, following Bochkarev's arrest the police took no action against Marković, even though they found two holograph manuscripts of his among Bochkarev's papers. Perhaps the reason for this was that the manuscripts were unexceptional documents. One was the constitution of *Srpska opština*, which was under the protection of the Asiatic Department and of which Marković was secretary. The other was a manuscript copy of Marković's article "To the Serbian Youth," which had been published six months earlier.<sup>48</sup> Both documents attested not to Marković's social democratic ideals but to his interest in the traditional policies of Serbian liberalism and Russian Pan-Slavism.

Originally Marković had intended to remain in St. Petersburg through

43. See his "Velika Srbija," *Sabrani spisi*, 1:97–115.

44. Pereira, "Chernyshevsky," pp. 130–52.

45. Marković grumbled about the liberals' tendency to talk more than act in February 1868 (*Sabrani spisi*, 1:7). Late in 1868 he refused an offer to become editor of a new liberal paper in Belgrade (1:120, 125, 129), and when he reached Zurich he wrote a friend as follows: "You say that our liberals are falling. . . . Well, let them fall, and a happy journey to them" (1:135–36). At this point Marković still believed that Vladimir Jovanović was "a more learned, honorable, and sincere liberal than any of them" (1:119).

46. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:80, 83.

47. Vuletić, *Marković i ruski demokrati*, p. 41.

48. Viktor Karasev, "Dva novykh avtografa Svetozara Markovicha," *Slaviane*, 1956, no. 9, not consulted (Vuletić, *Marković i ruski demokrati*, p. 39).

the school year and, during the summer of 1869, earn the money which would enable him to go to Switzerland, where he would be in closer touch with his "revolutionary brothers."<sup>49</sup> Instead, on January 22, 1869, he wrote the Serbian Ministry of Education to request a transfer to Germany on the grounds that the Russian climate was too harsh for his poor health, an estimate confirmed by a friendly doctor's report diagnosing his condition as "catarrhus gastro-intestinalis chronicus." A stipend had become vacant for study at either Karlsruhe or Zurich, and Marković pointed out to the Ministry that transfer to Zurich would save him one half year because of the different academic schedules used in Russia and the German-speaking lands.<sup>50</sup>

The belief that Marković was closely linked to underground elements has led to the theory that fear of arrest strongly influenced him to request transfer at this time. During the three months that elapsed between the arrest of Ivan Bochkarev and the time Marković applied for transfer, however, his letters do not betray any great sense of urgency. The Third Section did request his folder from the director of the Institute of Communication Engineers, but it is important to note that this request, which is the only concrete evidence of police interest in Marković, was made on February 7, 1869, more than two weeks after Marković formally asked to be sent to Zurich and several months after he had decided to leave Russia. The director of the Institute did not even reply to the Third Section's inquiry until after Marković's departure.<sup>51</sup> Historians have not speculated about the police pressures which might have caused Marković's friend and associate Aleksa Knežević to request transfer to Zurich for reasons of health one year prior to Marković; yet the dates of Knežević's request, approval, departure from St. Petersburg, and arrival in Zurich correspond closely to those of Marković one year later.<sup>52</sup> Without doubt Marković had no intention of continuing his study of engineering, and used the excuse of poor health and the difference in academic schedules as convenient pretexts. However, the conclusion is inescapable that the date of his departure was set not by his sudden realization that he was in danger from the police but by the difference between the Russian and German school calendars. A straightforward and uncomplicated interpretation is that Marković simply saw a logical way to convince the Serbian government to grant him the transfer he desired.

A few days before Marković departed Russia he wrote to a friend that he was "leaving for Zurich with 400 f."<sup>53</sup> Where did the poverty-stricken

49. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:83.

50. AS:MP-1874-VI-828. Cf. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:84.

51. Pushkarevich, "Markovich v Peterburge," p. 349.

52. For Knežević the dates (O.S.) were Jan. 31, 1868, Feb. 19, unknown, and Mar.

24. For Marković they were Jan. 10, 1869, Feb. 26, ca. Mar. 14, ca. Mar. 26 (AS-MP-1874-VI-828, AS:MP-1870-V-1122, McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 76).

53. *Sabrani spisi*, 1:130.

Marković get four hundred francs? Most historians, coupling their belief that Marković left Russia under police pressure with the assumption that he was closely connected with the secret Smorgon Academy, have jumped to the conclusion that “the Smorgon Academy commissioned Marković to create a link between the revolutionary groups in Russia and those in Switzerland.”<sup>54</sup> Despite his poor health Marković took on the assignment because, as Vuletić puts it, “In the essence of his being Svetozar was a revolutionary, . . . and he was not capable of sparing himself when he had a revolutionary mission to accomplish.”<sup>55</sup> Thus, in the best traditions of heroic socialism, Marković’s career in Russia reaches a fitting climax as the coughing revolutionary undertakes a conspiratorial mission to the European centers of the international movement.

Satisfying as this interpretation may be to our dramatic sense, the presumed revolutionary source of Marković’s travel funds is an invention. The Serbian government routinely approved requests for transfer such as Marković’s when they were justified for reasons of health or when they would be of educational value to the stipendist. Since Marković’s request fulfilled both these criteria, on March 10, 1869, the minister of education forwarded Marković his authorization to proceed to Zurich, along with an advance on his stipend and a sum of money for travel expenses. The total amount dispatched was slightly more than 568 francs, of which 360 francs were designated specifically to defray the costs of the trip from St. Petersburg to Zurich.<sup>56</sup> It was one week later that Marković wrote, “Just today I received the decision for transfer. I am leaving for Zurich with 400 f.” Prosaic and unromantic though it may be, the source of the money that Marković supposedly received from the Russian underground was actually the Serbian government.

Besides weakening the case for Marković’s revolutionary radicalism considerably by showing that the speculation about his mission to the European underground is based on a factual error, this interpretation also disposes of the uncritical assumption that the student riots which broke out in St. Peters-

54. McClellan, *Svetozar Marković*, p. 75.

55. Vuletić, “Marković u Rusiji,” p. 39.

56. A draft copy of the decision, dated Feb. 26, 1869 (O.S.), is in Marković’s file, AS:MP-1874-VI-838. I would like to thank Mr. Radivoj Lukić of Zrenjanin for rechecking this document for me. The Ministry sent Marković 1421 groš poreski, of which 900 were for travel expenses. Since the groš was a fictitious unit, the order also listed the actual money sent: nine imperials, twenty Louis d’or of ten francs each, ten twenty-kopek pieces, and one fifteen-kopek piece. At the rate of 40 centimes per groš poreski the total sum sent was 568 francs 40 centimes (rate from the table in the back of Vladimir Jovanović’s translation of Wilhelm Roscher, *Sistema narodne privrede*, Belgrade, 1863). At the standard rates for European money listed in the *Almanach de Gotha* the money sent equals 568 francs 60 centimes.

burg in March 1869 had a direct bearing on his departure.<sup>57</sup> Quite possibly the riots did have some effect on Marković's immediate plans, but they certainly had no fundamental influence on his intention to leave Russia. He requested transfer two months before these riots, and left St. Petersburg the moment he received the permission and the money. It is not incorrect to say Marković was under some pressure from the police early in 1869 because the Third Section had requested his dossier from the Institute. To suggest, however, that he hurriedly left St. Petersburg for fear of arrest after participation in the riots at the Medical Faculty and elsewhere is an exaggeration, dependent on the belief that Marković could only be motivated by those events which have been sanctified as revolutionary.

In place of the romantically revolutionary picture of Marković's stay in St. Petersburg we can now construct a less thrilling but more accurate account. Marković arrived in St. Petersburg in August 1866 with a modest knowledge of Russian, unformed but vigorous political ideas based on the liberal nationalism of Vladimir Jovanović, and a desire to train himself for service to his country as an engineer. During the first year and a half of his stay he moved in a narrow circle of Serbian friends and Russian Pan-Slavs while remaining committed to national uprising in Bosnia as the proper method of achieving national unification. In the summer of 1867 he visited his home in Serbia, where he discussed this possibility with his brother and others.

Early in 1868, through the good offices of Ivan Bochkarev, Marković came in contact with the work of Chernyshevsky and met several Russian radicals. By the middle of 1868 their influence began to change his outlook. The assassination of Prince Michael Obrenović in June 1868 and the almost immediate accommodation of the Serbian liberals to the regency which took office thereafter led Marković to analyze the new developments in Serbian politics in the light of his growing understanding of Chernyshevsky's populism and to re-evaluate his own plans in the light of his growing enchantment with radical activism. Concluding that he could no longer support either the monarchy or the liberals, he decided at the same time that his true calling was politics, not engineering. Accordingly, he applied to the Serbian government for a transfer to Switzerland, where he hoped to educate himself in his new vocation. When he received a favorable official decision and the necessary expense money in March 1869, he departed immediately for Zurich.

Once in Zurich, Marković began his political education in earnest. He read not only the European socialists, including Marx, but current scholarship in many other fields as well. He also cultivated contacts with the First Inter-

57. Vuletić is the most extreme example of this interpretation ("Marković i Prva internacionala," p. 161), but the idea originated with Skerlić, *Svetozar Marković*, pp. 35-36.

national and attracted a group of admiring Serbian students around him. As his writing became more vigorous his reputation grew, especially when his scathing critique of the Serbian constitution of 1869 led to the loss of his governmental stipend. In the spring of 1870 he formally broke off his last remaining tie with Serbian liberalism and began to call himself a socialist. Finally, deprived of his sole means of support by the loss of his stipend but filled with ideas and energy, he returned to Serbia, where he led and inspired his young nation's first radical political movement until his death in 1875.